REMARKS

Claims 1 to 18 are pending in the application. Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Jeschke.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following comments, and allowance of all the claims respectfully requested.

Rejection to Claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 9 and 18 depend respectively from claim 1 and claim 10, which recite solely a single stripper belt. Thus the recitation of the stripper belt is claims 9 and 18 is respectfully submitted as definite, as only one stripper belt is being recited. It is noted that claims 9 and 18 do not depend from claims 8 or 17 where a second stripper belt is recited. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection to Claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Jeschke. Jeschke discloses in Fig. 2 a stripper belt via guide 33, which belt runs around blade cylinder 31. In Fig. 1, an alternate embodiment, a belt is shown passing around a blade cylinder and brush roller 21.

Claim 1 recites "a continuous stripper belt disposed between the flat product and the axis of rotation over a second angle of rotation of the cylinder and configured to guide the flat product away from the cylinder so as to strip the flat product from the cylinder, the stripper belt following a continuous path that does not circumscribe the axis of rotation."

Each stripper belt shown in Fig. 1 or Fig. 2 of Jeschke circumscribes the axis of rotation of its respective cylinder, and thus does not meet the limitation of claim 1. The belt going around roller 21 shown in Fig. 1 clearly also circumscribes the axis of rotation of the blade cylinder 31, as does the belt in Fig. 2.

A copy of Fig. 1 showing the axis of rotation, i.e. the center of the cylinder, is attached hereto. The axis of rotation is clearly circumscribed by the belt.

With the present invention, the stripper belt is directed so as not to go around the axis of rotation, as shown in Fig. 1, which aids in replacement of the belt.

Claim 10 recites a similar limitation.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1 and 10 and their dependent claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully requested that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____

William Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940

Fig. 1